

REMARKS

In accordance to the foregoing, claims 1 and 13 have been amended. Antecedent basis for the claim changes can be found, for example, in paragraph 0003 of the application. Claims 2 and 14 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 3-13 and 15-20 are pending and under consideration.

In item 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner indicates that the Patent Office is missing a portion of the Information Disclosure Statement filed on September 25, 2001. To address this matter, an additional copy of the Information Disclosure Statement is enclosed.

In items 4-7 of the Office Action, the Examiner raises related objections. In item 4, the Examiner asserts that Fig. 1 does not show a portion of a complex process model for a technical system. In item 5, the Examiner questions what is meant by the term "orientation" in paragraph 0030 of the specification. In items 6 and 7, the Examiner rejects the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, raising various questions about the terms in the claims. The Examiner is referred to the Processing Modelling Guide (<http://www.for.gov.bc.ca/his/datadmin/s47.htm>) and the Overview of Process Modelling (<http://www.cs.man.ac.uk/ipg/Docs/pmover.html>). These two references are being filed herewith in an Information Disclosure Statement. The Processing Modelling Guide shows that the technical terms used in the application were thoroughly explained back in 1996. The Overview of Process Modelling provides additional background information. It is submitted that one of ordinary skill in the art would have understood the descriptive modeling subject matter of the present application or would have found articles, such the two articles mentioned above. Based on this knowledge or these articles, one of ordinary skill in the art would have understood the pre-processing method and system to which the present invention is directed.

For Fig. 1, the Examiner asserts that it shows a lot of lines, a few arrows, but does not show a portion of a complex process model for technical systems. The references describe how lines and arrows are used to model a technical system. The Examiner is referred to the Process Structure section of the Processing Modelling Guide. In addition, the Examiner is referred to the specification.

The Examiner questions the meaning of "orientation" in paragraph 0030. This term is defined in the application at paragraph 0013. "Orientation" shows a showing of a cause-and-effect relationship. Paragraph 0013 states that "A connection of activities and results such that orientation occurs from which it is apparent, inter alia, that an activity leads to a result and this result, if appropriate, again permits another activity."

In item 7.1, the Examiner questions what is meant by the "predefined relationship." Paragraph 0046 of the specification describes a causal relationship. Paragraph 0039 of the specification describes Fig. 4 of the application and conveys that the predefined relationship depends on the specific process being modeled and the cause effect relationships within that process. The Examiner is requested to reconsider the objections raised in items 4-7 in view of the specification, the above discussion and the references submitted herewith.

In items 8 and 9, the claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. It is believed that a plurality of the objections raised in item 9 will be overcome with a more thorough understanding of the invention. With regard to item 9.1, the Examiner questions terms such as "units." The claims have been amended to clarify that the units are units of an engineering process. The Examiner also questions what is meant by "a predefined connection criterion," and "an orientation". In view of the above discussed specification excerpts, it is submitted that these terms are now clear. With regard to item 9.4, the Examiner questions "a processing arrangement." It appears that the Examiner is referring to claim 13, not claim 12. Claim 13 has been amended to recite --A processing system--. Reconsideration of the indefiniteness rejection is requested in view of the foregoing.

With regard to item 10, claim 14 has been cancelled.

Claims 1, 3-5, 8, 9, 12-16, 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,375,070 Hershey et al. Claims 6, 7, 10, 11, 17 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Hershey et al. in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002-0042810 to Minami et al.

Hershey et al. discloses monitoring and control of performance aspects of a network on the basis of any tracing and preprocessing of available network data (transferred frames or bits and environmental data). According to the Hershey et al. method for information collection a programmable vector generator is set up with parameters characterizing the environment for the body of data in a vector C(i). Real-time identification of event behavior is performed in the environment for the body of data using the vector C(i). The event behavior is characterized for the identified events in a vector E(i). An analysis is performed of the event behavior for the body of data in the vector E(i). Control signals are automatically generated from the analysis, and the control signals are output to modify the behavior of the body of data. See claim 1

The Examiner is referred to the enclosed Overview of Process Modeling. This reference clarifies the difference between descriptive modeling and active modeling, and this is one of the differences between the subject matter of the application and the subject matter of Hershey et al.

The subject of the present application is in the area of descriptive modeling, whereas the subject of Hershey et al. is in the area of active modeling. Hershey et al. does not relate to "units of an engineering process" and a method and system for preprocessing to sort complicated activities which are carried out by a mobile agent with the aid of a template.

Because Hershey et al. does not relate to units of an engineering process, it is submitted that the anticipation rejection should be withdrawn.

Minami et al. is cited only for the additional limitations of claims 6, 7, 10, 11, 17 and 18. Minami et al. discloses an object, which is a member of a mobile object group operable to move from a first place to a second place under the control of a moderator agent. The mobile object can execute a first activity at the first place and a second activity at the second place. The object has a predecessor list having link information relative to said first activity, a successor list having link information relative to said second activity; and a moderation module for requiring said moderator agent to move from said first place to said second place. See claim 1.

Minami et al. does not compensate for the deficiencies discussed above with regard to Hershey et al. That is, Minami et al. contains no suggestions for "units for an engineering process" as claimed. Accordingly, it is submitted that the claims patentably distinguish over any proper combination of Hershey et al. and Minami et al.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courtesy solicited.

Finally, if there are any further matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: July 11 2005

By: Mark J. Henry
Mark J. Henry
Registration No. 36,162

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8(a)
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on July 11, 2005
By: Mark J. Henry
STAAS & HALSEY
Date: July 11 2005